

16 April 1946

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE DIRECTOR, STRATEGIC SERVICES UNIT
through [redacted]

25X1

SUBJECT: Request for Administrative Personnel and Services

REFERENCE: N.I.A. Directive No. 4

1. Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 2 of N.I.A. Directive No. 4, it is requested that the following personnel be made available to the Central Intelligence Group for the assignments indicated, in addition to their present duties in S.S.U.:

[redacted] Administrative Officer, C.I.G.
[redacted] Budget and Fiscal Officer, C.I.G.
Major WILLIAM G. THARP, AUS, Personnel Officer, C.I.G.

25X1

25X1

2. It is also requested that you make available, within your capabilities, to the Administrative Officer, C.I.G., the administrative facilities and services of S.S.U. which may be useful in the performance of an authorized function of the Central Intelligence Group.

"SIGNED"

SIDNEY W. SOUERS
Director

JS Lay: IH

MORI/CDF Page 2
&3 ONLY

NSC review completed.

CONFIDENTIAL

COPY NO. 5

I.A.B. 2nd Meeting

INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

AGENDA

For the Meeting to be held in Room 5132-C,
New War Department Building,
on Tuesday, 26 March 1946, at 1530

1. POLICY ON LIQUIDATION OF THE STRATEGIC SERVICES UNIT
(Memorandum from the Director of Central Intelligence,
23 March 1946, same subject, for the Members, I.A.B.)

References: a. C.I.G. Directive No. 1.

b. Report of ad hoc committee established
pursuant reference a.

For consideration of the Memorandum by the Director
of Central Intelligence, 23 March, enclosing draft
directives on the above subject.

JAMES S. LAY, JR.

Secretary, N.I.A.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

COPY NO. .24

I.A.B. 2nd Meeting

INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

AGENDA

For the Meeting to be held in Room 5132-C,
New War Department Building,
on Tuesday, 26 March 1946, at 1530

1. POLICY ON LIQUIDATION OF THE STRATEGIC SERVICES UNIT
(Memorandum from the Director of Central Intelligence,
23 March 1946, same subject, for the Members, I.A.B.)

References: a. C.I.G. Directive No. 1.

b. Report of ad hoc committee established
pursuant reference a.

For consideration of the Memorandum by the Director
of Central Intelligence, 23 March, enclosing draft
directives on the above subject.

JAMES S. LAY, JR.

Secretary, N.I.A.

CONFIDENTIAL

~~TOP SECRET~~

COPY NO.

18I.A.B. 2nd Meeting

(LIMITED DISTRIBUTION)

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE GROUPINTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of Meeting held in Room 5132-C
New War Department Building
on Tuesday, 26 March 1946, at 3:30 P.M.

Rear Admiral Sidney W. Souers, Director of
 Central Intelligence, in the Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Ludwell L. Montague (representing Mr. Alfred
 McCormack, Special Assistant to the Secretary
 of State in Charge of Research and Intelligence)
 Lt. General Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Assistant Chief of
 Staff, G-2, WDGS
 Commodore Charles J. Rend (Representing Rear Admiral
 Thomas B. Inglis, Chief of Naval Intelligence)
 Brig. General George C. McDonald, Assistant Chief of
 Air Staff, Intelligence
 Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau
 of Investigation

ALSO PRESENT

25X1

Mr. Kingman Douglass, Central Intelligence Group
 [redacted] Central Intelligence Group
 [redacted] Central Intelligence
 Group
 Colonel Charles P. Nicholas, USA, Central Intelligence
 Group
 Colonel Harry F. Cunningham, USA, Central Intelligence
 Group
 Colonel Willis A. Perry, USA, Central Intelligence Group

SECRETARIAT

Mr. James S. Lay, Jr., Secretary, National Intelligence
 Authority
 Mr. J. K. Tibby, Assistant Secretary

~~TOP SECRET~~I.A.B. 2nd Meeting

Document No.	
No Change in Class. <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Declassified	
Class. Changed to: TS <u>(S)</u> C	25X1
Next Review Date:	
Auth.: HR 70-3	
Date: <u>19 Sept 91</u>	
By:	

~~TOP SECRET~~1. POLICY ON LIQUIDATION OF THE STRATEGIC SERVICES UNIT

The directives proposed for submittal to the National Intelligence Authority were read and minor amendments agreed upon.

ADMIRAL SOUERS emphasized that the intention was not to absorb SSU as an entity within the Central Intelligence Group, but rather to assure the careful liquidation of the Unit, over a period of months, so as to utilize its services during that period and to permit the preservation and transfer to permanent departments and agencies of SSU elements found to be of continuing usefulness.

GENERAL VANDENBERG asked whether under the contemplated liquidation procedure, the G-2 of U.S. Forces, in the China Theater would be protected from the liquidation of the SSU unit now in China before other arrangements could be made by G-2 to provide for those operations considered essential by G-2.

ADMIRAL SOUERS said that this was an example of the departmental interests which the proposed liquidation directives were designed to protect. He recalled that General Vandenberg had recently forwarded to C.I.G. a plan for post-war intelligence in China as prepared by G-2, USFCT. In the course of planning post-war intelligence coverage in that area, it might be found desirable to charge C.I.G. itself with responsibility for filling certain gaps. However, C.I.G. could not enter such fields directly except by authorization of the National Intelligence Authority, and in the meantime it would be the task of the Director of Central Intelligence to insure that no available and necessary services were discarded, through liquidation of SSU, until services as good or better could be provided to take their place.

COMMODORE REND proposed a revision of the paper designed to clarify its language, but after Admiral Souers explained the reasons for the present language of the paper, Commodore Rend expressed his agreement.

MR. HOOVER said he was glad to see that the directives provided for gradual rather than abrupt liquidation, since this would more readily permit the retention of valuable elements by the Government. He thought the objectives were very satisfactorily expressed.

After concluding discussion,

THE INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD:-

Concurred in the draft directives as amended (subsequently submitted to the National Intelligence Authority as N.I.A. 3).

2. C.I.G. WEEKLY SUMMARY

ADMIRAL SOUERS reported that plans for issuance of a C.I.G. Weekly Summary were in hand. The Central Reports Staff had worked up several practice issues. However, it was clear that if the Weekly were to fulfill its real function--and be more than a rehash of preceding Daily Summaries--two or three seasoned intelligence officers with specialized experience would have to be added to the staff. He was attempting to strengthen the present staff with this in mind, by negotiations with the several departments.

THE INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD:-

Took note of the above comments.

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~3. J.I.C. PAPERS

THE DIRECTOR said that arrangements had been made with the Joint Intelligence Committee for C.I.G. to receive copies of appropriate J.I.C. papers. In reply the Secretary of J.I.C. had suggested that all C.I.G. papers be furnished to his office for file and for the use of the Joint Intelligence Staff. Admiral Souers was willing to send appropriate C.I.G. papers to the Secretary of J.I.C., but felt that many papers of C.I.G. would not be of benefit to J.I.S. and should therefore not be sent.

THE INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD:-

Concurred with Admiral Souers' proposed policy.

4. SPECIAL AGENTS

GENERAL VANDENBERG inquired how soon the Central Intelligence Group would be in a position to interview the individuals who are now presenting themselves as prospective special agents abroad. General Vandenberg said there were a number of these candidates, and that he was using a few of them. He is anxious to turn such activities over to the Central Intelligence Group, however, as soon as possible, because of the danger that agents from different agencies may get crossed up in the field.

ADMIRAL SOUERS stated that he wanted to be completely prepared to conduct such operations before interviewing or hiring any individuals. He does not want to confuse the permanent program with the existing operations of SSU. One of the biggest problems will be to find the appropriate man to head this operation, who can then utilize the services of these individuals on a professional basis. In the meantime, Admiral Souers would prefer that existing agencies conduct their operations in this field until a permanent program has been decided upon by the N.I.A. and established.

25X1

This will not be a "cloak and dagger" type of operation, but will require careful organization.

GENERAL VANDENBERG expressed the belief, and Admiral Souers agreed, that all such clandestine operations should be under a single directing head.

THE INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD:-

Took note of the above discussion.

~~TOP SECRET~~
IAE 2nd Meeting

S E C R E T

COPY NO. 34

I.A.B. 11th Meeting

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE GROUP

INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

AGENDA

For the Meeting to be held in Room 2178
New War Department Building
on Tuesday, 26 November 1946, at 10:00 A.M.

1. COORDINATION OF COLLECTION ACTIVITIES
(C.I.G. 18/2)

For consideration of the recommendations
contained in C.I.G. 18/2.

2. PRODUCTION OF POLITICAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY ON U.S.S.R.
(C.I.G. 20)

For consideration of the recommendations
contained in C.I.G. 20.

3. EXPLOITATION OF ENEMY DOCUMENT REPOSITORIES
(C.I.G. 21)

For consideration of the recommendations
contained in C.I.G. 21.

JAMES S. LAY, JR.

Secretary, N.I.A.

131
SECRET
IAB 11th Meeting

52

COPY NO. 36

CONFIDENTIAL

I.A.B. 12th Meeting

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE GROUP

INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of Meeting held in Room 2178
New War Department Building
on Tuesday, 17 December 1946, at 2:30 P.M.

Lt. General Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Director of
Central Intelligence, in the Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. William A. Eddy, Special Assistant to the
Secretary of State for Research and In-
telligence
Maj. General Stephen J. Chamberlin, Director
of Intelligence, WDGS
Rear Admiral Thomas B. Inglis, Chief of Naval
Intelligence
Brig. General John A. Samford, Deputy Assistant
Chief of Air Staff-2

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. A. Sidney Buford, Department of State
Colonel E. J. Treacy, U.S.A.
Captain R. K. Davis, U.S.N.
[redacted] Central Intelligence Group
[redacted] Central Intelligence Group 25X1

25X1

SECRETARIAT

Mr. J. S. Earman, Acting Secretary, N.I.A.

CONFIDENTIAL
IAB 12th Meeting

140

1. COORDINATION OF COLLECTION ACTIVITIES
(C.I.G. 18/3)

GENERAL VANDENBERG stated that he understood that there was some confusion as to why C.I.G. 18/3, as circulated, only includes the texts of the proposed N.I.A. Directive and omits the proposed text of the C.I.G. Directive. He stated that C.I.G. 18/2, as circulated on November 21, included both a proposed N.I.A. Directive and a proposed C.I.G. Directive, but the transmitting letter carefully specified that I.A.B. approval was requested only for the N.I.A. Directive. Therefore, in consideration of the State Department's urgent request for early consideration of the N.I.A. Directive, it was circulated in C.I.G. 18/3 with the amendments proposed by the I.A.B. ad hoc committee. He said that at the same time the completed draft of the C.I.G. Directive was circulated to the ad hoc committee members since there had not been time to present this cleaned up text to them; however, the ad hoc committee had approved this text in pencil form at its last meeting. General Vandenberg pointed out that C.I.G. 18/3 has only minor changes from C.I.G. 18/2 in the N.I.A. Directive section and that at the last I.A.B. meeting general approval of the N.I.A. Directive had been given and no specific requests for changes therein had been made. He said that he believed that the I.A.B. would be able to approve without extensive discussion the text as presented in C.I.G. 18/3, particularly since his proposals for implementation, as contained in the ad hoc committee's final draft, include all suggestions made by the agencies' ad hoc representatives and were concurred in by them at their final meeting. General Vandenberg recommended that in paragraph 1 c of the proposed N.I.A. Directive the words "unproductive duplication and uncoordinated overlap shall be discontinued so . . ." be allowed to remain.

MR. EDDY stated that he would like to recommend that paragraphs 2 a and c of the proposed C.I.G. implementing Directive should be included in the proposed N.I.A. Directive since paragraph 2 a included allocations by subject and

CONFIDENTIAL

paragraph 2 c reserved the right of every agency to repeat even on secondary interest to its own agency anything it desired.

GENERAL VANDENBERG then asked how A-2 and O.N.I. felt about the State Department's recommendation as indicated above.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that after some discussion in the Intelligence Division, WDGS, they were not sure whether the meaning of paragraph 2 c of the proposed C.I.G. Directive was understood. He went on to state that all G-2 reports were submitted on duplicating pads and questioned whether or not G-2's representatives in the field should merely pass over to the proper agency at the post or the Embassy whatever information they might have.

MR. EDDY then stated that this was his understanding.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he would object to any interpretation to indicate that, for example, the State Department's representative report directly to him or his representative (General Chamberlin's) report directly to the State Department.

MR. EDDY then stated that those reports would be passed on to the representatives in the field and a copy sent to the State Department.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then said that he would like to indicate that all the information passed in from the field, except radiographic forms, from the MA's come on a duplicating pad and not as copies.

GENERAL VANDENBERG then stated that there was no intention to have any such interpretation as indicated by General Chamberlin.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he had no desire to make any change in the paragraph but that he wanted to be sure that somebody would not object to the Intelligence Division following its usual procedures of sending the duplicating pad to the Intelligence Division in Washington since the information contained therein was given immediately to the agency concerned.

CONFIDENTIAL

IAB 12th Meeting

- 2 -

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. EDDY then stated that in this paragraph they wanted the men in the field who came across intelligence not of primary interest to them, but of secondary interest, to pass that information to the field representative of the agency primarily concerned. Nothing, however, should prevent a representative from reporting to his own department chief for staff purposes.

GENERAL VANDENBERG then stated that what Mr. Eddy had just said was the principle that was being enunciated in the directives and he would be the first to protest if the agencies were to stop sending information that was not of primary interest to them to C.I.G.

ADMIRAL INGLIS then stated that to clarify this paragraph we should be rather careful of the wording.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then stated that he had this comment to make after reading these directives - The C.I.G. and N.I.A. Directives uniformly violate the basic principle that in assigning a task, the task should be described in sufficiently clear language for an agency to understand. The agency should be permitted to instruct its subordinates in its own language and that he did not propose to send a C.I.G. Directive to his own people.

GENERAL VANDENBERG then stated that the implementation of C.I.G. Directives by the agencies concerned was "their own business."

ADMIRAL INGLIS then suggested the following change in the language of the paragraph in question: "That we delete the word 'directly' in the second line of sub-paragraph c and insert in the third line before the word 'representative' the word 'field' and then in the last line instead of 'copies' insert 'information to.' It would then read: 'Intelligence information and material regardless of the collector, shall wherever possible be transmitted to the agency most concerned through the field representative of that agency. However, the collector may also send information to his own agency.'"

MR. EDDY stated that he did not believe that he could approve the rewording of paragraph 2 c, as indicated by Admiral Inglis.

CONFIDENTIAL
IAB 12th Meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then stated that the Intelligence Division distributed to no one outside of the War Department unless a request was received through the Reading Panel and that no automatic distribution was made to the State Department's representative on the Reading Panel unless he (State Department's representative) requested it.

MR. EDDY then stated that he thought the purpose was to get information to the agency primarily concerned and most interested.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then stated "providing the agency is interested."

MR. EDDY then went on to state that he would not expect reports on military and naval matters to appear in the State Department's Reading Panel which had been collected by a Vice-Consul where there was no military or naval representative present. Mr. Eddy further stated that he concurred in that a report prepared by military or naval personnel should have dissemination made in Washington; however, that political intelligence should be screened by the State Department, and military and air intelligence, for example, should be passed to the man in the field who represented that service. When such reports come to the Department's Reading Panel concerned that Department can then send these reports wherever they may deem necessary. The reporting officer's obligation is then the same as formerly - "He sends a copy of his information to his own agency."

GENERAL SAMFORD then asked whether the use of the word "copy" meant it was identified by being outside the agency's primary field.

MR. EDDY stated that before, when the State Department had an opportunity to get naval information, the Vice-Consul would send that information to the naval attache, since he (the Vice-Consul) couldn't interpret it and there would be confusion if they were to send it to the State Department.

ADMIRAL INGLIS stated that that was the very reason why he had recommended the re-wording of paragraph 2 c in order to avoid describing how a copy of a report was to be sent to G-2 or O.N.I.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. EDDY stated that in Washington it is recognized as a report that is to be produced or distributed and be available in the department of primary interest.

ADMIRAL INGLIS then stated that he supposed that this fact would be written across the face of the report; that it was a naval subject, and that the Military Attache, for example, had picked it up and given the information to the Naval Attache. Admiral Inglis went on to state that the Military Attache could, for example, write across the face of the report "I have given this information to the Naval Attache."

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he did not want to change his system since his people were accustomed to put in reports on duplicating pads and as these reports came in they were placed on a mimeograph machine and the number of copies indicated by the Reading Panel were run off. Thus copies are available for State, Navy, A-2 and C.I.G.

MR. EDDY then stated that he foresaw difficulties in the future if the State Department, for example, disseminated widely and also had Reading Panels and disseminated reports from military and naval observers, and some dissemination was made the other way around. Mr. Eddy went on to state that he felt that distribution of reports should be made by the Department having primary interest.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then stated that there could be very easily inserted a statement in the report which would indicate to whom the report had been submitted.

MR. EDDY suggested that paragraph 2 c could possibly read "... field representatives of the agency most concerned. However, the collector may send copies to his own agency."

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he did not object to that wording. However, he wanted to be sure that everyone knew of the kind of copy used by the Intelligence Division, namely, a repeating pad. He went on to state that the Intelligence Division made distribution within its own agency and that they could attempt to keep from distributing to other agencies unless such agencies' representatives on the Reading Panel insisted on having the information.

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. EDDY questioned whether or not there were "other people" on the Reading Panel.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that the only agencies outside of the War Department having representatives on the Intelligence Division Reading Panel were the State and Navy Departments, and occasionally C.I.G.

MR. EDDY then suggested that paragraph 2 c of the proposed C.I.G. Directive read: "Intelligence information material regardless of the collector shall wherever possible be transmitted immediately to the field representative of the agency most concerned. However, the collector may send copies to his own agency."

MR. EDDY then distributed a proposed change in the wording of the first page of the proposed N.I.A. Directive. Mr. Eddy, after some discussion of this proposal, stated that political and economic intelligence had been bracketed in the State Department for a number of years. Furthermore, modern economics are no more political, as related to political, that we used to study in school. It now pertains to industrial establishments, in addition to protection for most of our American trade. The State Department is quite prepared to have economic intelligence not allocated, but recognized as a vital interest.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that this was difficult for him to go along with and that he could say frankly that he thought it was splitting a field that should never be split. He went on to say that the field of intelligence covered not only collection but also production of intelligence, and it was his feeling and had been all along that the Intelligence Advisory Board should get down to the fundamental principles and solve the overall responsibilities for these departments for the whole intelligence field, as suggested at the last meeting of the Intelligence Advisory Board. General Chamberlin then said that apparently the Intelligence Advisory Board was not in complete agreement along these lines so he was willing to go along with this splitting of the collection field,

CONFIDENTIAL
IAB 12th Meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

before the Intelligence Advisory Board tackled the fundamental principles since he thought that this, perhaps, was a forward step.

GENERAL VANDENBERG said that he agreed with the ultimate objective as stated by General Chamberlin and that this was a forward step. He went on to say that the Intelligence Advisory Board was going to have to cooperate and bite this problem off piece by piece. General Vandenberg further said that there are many things that the Intelligence Advisory Board can not now agree upon. However, there were some things on which there could be agreement by one or two of the members giving room.

GENERAL SAMFORD stated that he thought it would be better to keep the allocation by subject, which was a step forward, in the proposed C.I.G. Directive, instead of placing it in the proposed N.I.A. Directive.

GENERAL VANDENBERG said that he agreed with General Samford's statement, but if, as we go along, we find that we need something else done, amendments could be made. Further, that he would rather make amendments than make the original directives too broad.

MR. EDDY stated that he wished to propose that paragraph 1 b of the proposed N.I.A. Directive be changed to read as follows: "The American Ambassador or Minister, or the ranking U. S. Foreign Service Officer of each Diplomatic Mission or Foreign Service Post shall be responsible for insuring proper implementation of a coordinated collection program in that area. In areas where a U. S. Commander has the predominant responsibility, he is the Senior U. S. Representative responsible for insuring proper implementation of a coordinated collection program in that area."

CAPTAIN DAVIS then stated that the Navy had a comment to make. The 7th Fleet, for instance, operates outside the governing principles of this entirely. That thought was inter-checked in C.I.G. 18/2 and was in line as recommended. He asked if something similar to the following could not be put back - "Where foreign service establishments and a senior U. S. military commander both have jurisdiction in an area, each will

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

be responsible for the activities of the personnel under his administrative control."

GENERAL VANDENBERG then stated that this could be accomplished by the agencies' writing their people their understanding of this Directive in the areas in question. He suggested that instructions by the home offices of the agencies be coordinated with ICAPS and the representatives of the agencies in order that the instructions be written in unison. General Vandenberg went on to say that this coordination could well be centered in ICAPS since that was where the agencies and C.I.G. come together.

MR. EDDY suggested that there would be another sentence added to paragraph 1 b of the proposed N.I.A. Directive to read as follows: "This does not apply to the intelligence personnel directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff or Theatre Commanders."

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he was somewhat confused about the words "Senior U. S. representative" and said that he was perfectly agreeable to using the words "Senior Diplomatic representative."

GENERAL VANDENBERG then suggested that paragraph 1 b of the proposed N.I.A. Directive read as follows: "The senior U. S. representative in each foreign area where the United States maintains a foreign service mission shall be responsible for the coordination of all collection activities within his area, and for the proper implementation of the requirements and responsibilities of the respective agencies."

MR. EDDY stated that "If you don't care about any recognition in the occupied areas, I don't differ from that."

GENERAL VANDENBERG stated that it was up to the agencies to send out the proper instructions. However, he recommended that in any border line cases that the Intelligence Advisory Board get together on such cases before the instructions were sent to the field.

MR. EDDY then stated that this recommendation was all right with the State Department.

CONFIDENTIAL
LAB 12th Meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

CAPTAIN DAVIS stated that the Navy would like to have it in the minutes that this would not specifically apply to the operating forces.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN suggested that paragraph 1 b of the proposed N.I.A. Directive be changed to read as follows: "For the coordination of all collection activities in his area within the spirit of the principles enunciated herein." He further stated that he believed that it was a mistake to charge the Ambassadors with the implementation of someone else's directive and authorize them in the line of command of that particular department since the Ambassadors were charged with coordination.

MR. EDDY said that he felt that General Chamberlin's restriction should be in the heading and not in any one subparagraph since it applies only to the limits of this Directive within the limits of principle.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he would hesitate to give the Ambassadors authority to do anything they might desire. He further stated that his statement above was binding on them (the Ambassadors) since the Ambassadors should coordinate collection of intelligence in accordance with the agreement reached by the Intelligence Advisory Board.

GENERAL VANDENBERG repeated his suggestion that paragraph 1 b of the proposed N.I.A. Directive read as previously indicated.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then stated that he wanted it very definitely understood that his agreement with this paragraph confines the responsibility of the implementation of the coordination measures, not the implementation of the intelligence collection.

GENERAL VANDENBERG stated that he thought that General Chamberlin's understanding had to be accepted since he (General Chamberlin) had certain responsibilities as does the Chief of Naval Intelligence.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then suggested another change that he had in mind which might help to clarify paragraph 1 f of the proposed N.I.A. Directive, which change reads as follows:

"After the words 'transmission to' insert 'respective home

CONFIDENTIAL

IAB 12th Meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

offices in Washington.' Paragraph 1 f would then read:
' . . . abroad are individually responsible for the collection
and for the appropriate transmission to their respective home
offices in Washington. . . .'

General Chamberlin further stated that the above change
was suggested since he wanted to be sure that Military Attaches
would not transmit information direct to the State and Navy
Departments here in Washington.

GENERAL VANDENBERG stated that he did not feel that
this change was necessary since the Intelligence Division's
instructions to its MA's could prevent any such action.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that the reason he made
this point was because it might violate another Directive which
was on its way for consideration.

MR. EDDY noted that if General Chamberlin's suggested
change above was adopted, it would prevent certain coordination
in the field.

After further discussion it was decided to leave para-
graph 1 f of the proposed N.I.A. Directive as originally written.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN asked if he was correct in judging
that this was authority given by the National Intelligence
Authority to the Ambassadors, not the State Department, as the
senior representative.

MR. EDDY stated that he thought that it was broader
than that and that it was a matter of the President's represen-
tative abroad.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN then stated that he just wanted to
be sure that it was authority given to the Ambassadors in view
of their position.

MR. EDDY went on to state that the Ambassador's Charge
d'Affaires represented him just as a Deputy Commander and that
the Charge d'Affaires had all the Ambassador's authority in his
absence.

CAPTAIN DAVIS then stated that he wanted to indicate in
the minutes that as far as the Army and Navy are concerned that
the allocations contained in the proposed N.I.A. Directive were

CONFIDENTIAL
TAB 12th Meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

a little broad and that he would like to bring forth allocations made in a joint letter between the Army and Navy in August, 1945. Captain Davis asked whether or not these allocations would still in fact be in effect.

GENERAL VANDENBERG stated that the allocations had purposely been left broad.

GENERAL CHAMBERLIN stated that he thought that the agreement mentioned by Captain Davis would still stand.

GENERAL VANDENBERG stated that he could not say that this agreement was still in effect and that it was between the Army and Navy. General Vandenberg commented -- "I can not agree or disagree."

The Intelligence Advisory Board adjourned without approving C.I.G. 18/3.

- - - - -

NOTE:

Subsequently, the Intelligence Advisory Board, by voting slip, approved C.I.G. 18/3, (which has been published as N.I.A. Directive No. 7) with the following changes:

Paragraph 2 c of the proposed C.I.G. Directive to read "Intelligence information and material regardless of the collector shall, wherever possible, be transmitted immediately to the field representative of the agency most concerned. However, the collector may also send copies to his own agency." inserted as paragraph 1 b of N.I.A. Directive No. 7.

Insertion of sub-paragraphs 2 a and c, as amended, of the proposed C.I.G. Directive into N.I.A. Directive No. 7 as paragraph 1 a and b, respectively.

Paragraph 1 b of the proposed N.I.A. Directive to read as follows: "The senior U. S. representative in each foreign area where the United States maintains a foreign service post shall be responsible for the coordination of all collection activities in his area and the proper implementation of that coordination within the spirit of the principles enunciated herein." inserted in N.I.A. Directive No. 7 as paragraph 1 c.

CONFIDENTIAL
IAB 12th Meeting

CONFIDENTIAL

Paragraph 1 c of the proposed N.I.A. Directive was amended as follows: "In order to avoid unproductive duplication and uncoordinated overlap all collection facilities will be utilized to their maximum within budgetary limitations for the production of that full flow of intelligence material which is the major need of all departments." and inserted in N.I.A. Directive No. 7 as paragraph 1 d.

CONFIDENTIAL
TAB 12th Meeting

- 12 -

Page Denied